

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Matt Simons, Realty Specialist

Field Office: Stillwater Field Office

Lead Office: Stillwater Field Office

Case File/Project Number: NVN-091006

Applicable Categorical Exclusion: H-1790-1, Appendix 4 E(17)

“Grant of a short rights-of-way for utility service or terminal access roads to an individual residence, outbuilding, or water well.”

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2013-0044-CX

Project Name: Luning communications site access roads.

Project Description: Short terminal access road to bypass private property where an easement cannot be obtained by the applicant. The existing communications site (comm site) is located on a private parcel owned by a different individual. The new access road would be approximately 800-feet long, with a 10-foot wide travel surface, and would disturb approximately .2 acres of public land. A 20-foot right-of-way would be issued to accommodate the new road, drainage structures (culverts, wing ditches, etc.) if needed in the future, and additional work space for construction or maintenance. The road would be used for the life of the comm site, estimated to be 30 or more years. The existing road on private land would be reclaimed and no longer used unless the landowner provides a written request to leave the road.

Additional acreage along the west side of the existing comm site, which was constructed on private land, would be included to address a minor encroachment onto public lands. The service road on the west side of the equipment building crosses onto public lands. The additional space, approximately 83-feet long by 10-feet wide (between the east edge of the road ROW and the property line, for the length of the surveyed comm site boundary), would capture the encroaching road segments in the ROW. The additional space would also allow for fill material to fall onto public lands should the applicant decide to level the southwest corner of the comm site. The existing service road could be used in its current configuration. Should the applicant decide to fence the site, the area between the property line and the new road ROW in section 24 would be reclaimed and allowed to revegetate.

Applicant Name: Arizona Nevada Tower Corporation (ANTC)

Project Location: MDM, T. 8 N., R. 34 E., Section 24: E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ (within).

BLM Acres for the Project Area: Approximately .387 acres total

Land Use Plan Conformance:

Administrative Actions #6, page LND-7: “Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public.”

Name of Plan: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range)		X
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology, Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		X
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		X
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		X
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (PEC)		X
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		X
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (Archeology)		X
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (Wildlife)		X
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and Archeology)		X
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		X
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? (Archeology)		X
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (Range)		X

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Planning Environmental Coordinator: Angelica Rose

Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds: Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson

Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC: Dan Westermeyer

Archeology: Jason Wright

Wildlife: Chris Kula

Soils: Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

_____/S/_____
Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

_____09/13/13_____
(date)